1	Matthew Franklin Jaksa (CA State Bar No. 248072)	
2	HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP 560 Mission Street, 25 th Floor	
3	San Francisco, CA 94105-2994	
4	Telephone: (415) 268-2000 Facsimile: (415) 268-1999	
5	Email: matt.jaksa@hro.com	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs,	
7	SONY BMG MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT; ARISTA RECORDS LLC; UMG	
	RECORDINGS, INC.; and ELEKTRA	
8	ENTERTAINMENT GROUP INC.	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
11		
12	SONY BMG MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, a	CASE NO. 3:07-CV-04859-CRB
13	Delaware general partnership; ARISTA RECORDS LLC, a Delaware limited liability	Honorable Charles R. Breyer
14	company; UMG RECORDINGS, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ELEKTRA	EX PARTE APPLICATION TO CONTINUE
15	ENTERTAINMENT GROUP INC., a Delaware	CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
16	corporation, Plaintiffs,	AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
17	Framuits,	
	V.	
18	JOHN DOE	
19	JOHN DOE, Defendant.	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Ex Parte Application and [Proposed] Order Case No. 3:07-cv-04859-CRB #36369 v1

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court continue the case management conference currently set for April 4, 2008 at 8:30 a.m. to July 11, 2008. As set forth in greater detail below, Plaintiffs have not yet discovered the true identity of the Doe defendant in this case, and will be unable to do so unless the Court grants Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate Discovery, filed on September 20, 2007 and entered as Docket No. 3.

- 1. The Court issued a December 26, 2007 Order granting Plaintiffs' previous request (made on the same grounds stated herein) for a 90-day continuance of the case management conference and 120-day extension of time for service of process.
- 2. Plaintiffs filed the Complaint for Copyright Infringement against Defendant John Doe ("Defendant") on September 20, 2007. Plaintiffs did not have sufficient identifying information to name Defendant in the Complaint, but were able to identify Defendant by the Internet Protocol address assigned by Defendant's Internet Service Provider here, University of San Francisco ("USF").
- 3. In order to determine Defendant's true identity, Plaintiffs filed their *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate Discovery on September 20, 2007, seeking the Court's permission to serve a Rule 45 subpoena on USF. The Court has not yet ruled on Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate Discovery.
- 4. If the Court grants Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate Discovery, Plaintiffs will attempt to determine Defendant's identity by serving a Rule 45 subpoena on USF. If Defendant is identified, Plaintiffs will give Defendant written notice of their claim and attempt to contact Defendant and resolve the dispute. If the dispute cannot be resolved, Plaintiffs plan to file a First Amended Complaint naming Defendant individually and then proceed to serve process upon him or her.
- 5. However, unless the Court grants Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate Discovery, Plaintiffs cannot identify the Doe defendant, initiate settlement talks, or name Defendant individually and begin service attempts.
- 6. Given the foregoing circumstances, and because there is no known defendant with whom to confer, a case management conference is unnecessary at this time. Plaintiffs therefore